

GROWTH MANAGEMENT PLANNING COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM
KING COUNTY, WASHINGTON

AGENDA TITLE: Update of the Countywide Planning Policies

PRESENTED BY: Interjurisdictional Staff Team

SUMMARY

The focus of the September GMPC meeting is to present staff progress on CPP updates. This report responds to direction provided by GMPC and preferred by the Executive Committee. It is organized as follows:

- **Executive Committee Direction:** staff presents the direction provided by the Executive Committee for consideration of the full council
- **Progress and Methodology:** staff presents draft policy language for a fully revised Environment Chapter and FW-1, Step 9 (review and amendments to the CPPs).
- **Public Outreach:** staff presents a public outreach strategy in this CPP update work program as directed by the Executive Committee.
- **Staff Recommendation:** while no formal action by GMPC is requested at this time, staff seeks feedback from GMPC regarding the direction expressed by the draft policies included herein.
- **Attachment A:** staff provides a proposed chapter outline for the CPP document for GMPC consideration.
- **Attachment B:** staff proposes draft policy language for the Environment chapter and existing FW-1, Step 9.
- **Attachment C:** staff provides the August 12 Executive Committee staff report for GMPC review and comment.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE DIRECTION

At its June meeting, GMPC provided general direction to staff regarding the full scope of topics addressed in the CPPs. Since that time, staff has focused its effort primarily on the topics presented today. An Executive Committee meeting on August 12 provided more specific direction on today's topics. Direction provided by the Executive Committee for consideration of the full council follows.

Issue 1. Climate Change and the Environment

The Executive Committee directed staff to draft policy language in accordance with option 2 below and prepare a work plan to inventory existing city efforts and research options for a common measurement tool and development review approach. Staff has responded to this

direction by proposing a policy to establish a countywide greenhouse gas reduction target. Staff notes that the establishment of a countywide greenhouse gas reduction target will constitute a separate work program for the GMPC.

Staff presentation. Policy options for incorporating climate change in the CPPs:

- 1) Broad goal statements and a commitment to comply with state law.
- 2) #1 plus additional guidance on implementation without mandating specific standards/ approach.
- 3) #1 plus specific standards and quantifiable targets such as setting minimum thresholds to be incorporated into SEPA review and/or setting community-based targets.

Issue 2. Transfer of Development Rights

The Executive Committee concurred with the staff recommendation below and further directed staff to prepare a work plan to research and present TDR incentive options. Staff is continuing this work and anticipates a report of progress to GMPC in December, 2010.

Staff recommendation. Strengthen the TDR language to preserve rural and resource lands, including the limitation of rural to rural transfers and prohibition of resource to rural transfers.

Issue 3. Housing

The Executive Committee directed staff to continue work on the housing issues identified below. Staff is continuing this work and anticipates a report of progress to GMPC in December, 2010.

Staff Presentation. Staff provided an update on the work of a technical committee examining multiple housing issues, including:

- 1) the effect of the current housing policies on overall affordability;
- 2) the methodology used to develop the current housing targets;
- 3) the ability of jurisdictions to monitor progress toward targets; and
- 4) the role of local governments in implementing the housing goals

Issue 4. Regional Economic Strategy

The Executive Committee directed staff to prepare a work plan to provide greater emphasis on the Regional Economic Strategy as provided in option 2 below. Staff is continuing this work and anticipates a report of progress to GMPC in December, 2010.

Staff Presentation. Policy options for incorporating the Regional Economic Strategy in CPPs:

- 1) Reference and reinforce the current strategy to encourage growth in the strategy's identified industry clusters.
- 2) Provide greater emphasis on economic elements of the Regional Economic Strategy specific to King County (e.g., locational centers for certain clusters; micro-clusters).

Issue 5. Economic Activities in Rural Cities and Resource Lands

The Executive Committee concurred with the staff recommendation below, acknowledging the concept of economic viability of Rural Cities in their role within the Rural Area.

Staff Recommendation. Draft policy EC-1: Design economic development in the Rural Cities to be at a size and scale that will ensure compatibility with the surrounding rural and natural resource lands and that will prevent future extension of urban services outside of the city boundaries.

Issue 6. Healthy Communities

The Executive Committee directed staff to integrate public health throughout the CPPs as provided in option 1 below. Staff is continuing this work and anticipates a report of progress to GMPC in December, 2010.

Staff Presentation. Options for incorporating public health into the CPPs:

- 1) Integrate policies throughout the CPPs in the appropriate topical chapters.*
- 2) Create a distinct “Healthy Communities” chapter in the CPPs.*

Issue 7. Regional Coordination and Finance

The Executive Committee directed staff to integrate regional coordination and finance throughout the CPPs as provided in option 1 below. This staff report provides an update of staff progress.

Staff Presentation. Options for incorporating regional coordination and finance into the CPPs:

- 1) Integrate policies throughout the CPPs in the appropriate topical chapters.*
- 2) Create a distinct “Regional Coordination and Finance” chapter in the CPPs.*

PROGRESS AND METHODOLOGY

This section of the staff report provides an update of staff progress—including draft policy language—in two key policy areas: the Environment and Regional Coordination and Finance.

Climate Change and the Environment

The Executive Committee directed staff to focus its attention on climate change, addressing both a countywide greenhouse gas reduction target, and guidance and tools to help local jurisdictions implement measures to meet that target. Staff proposes five draft policies addressing air quality and climate change specifically. Staff notes that the establishment of a countywide greenhouse gas reduction target will constitute a separate work program for the GMPC.

Staff is not presenting specific guidance or tools for the reduction of greenhouse gasses at this time, but proposes that such direction could be provided in the text of the CPP document as policy language is finalized.

In addition to providing policy language addressing climate change, staff is proposing policy language addressing Environmental Sustainability, Earth and Habitat, Flood Hazards, and Water Resources. These policies are consistent with the direction provided by VISION 2040. With an emphasis on environmental stewardship, VISION 2040 uses environmental sustainability as the framework for the multi-county planning policies. According to VISION, “a sustainable approach is one that strengthens the region’s economic, social, and environmental resiliency, while enhancing our ability to cope with adverse trends, including the challenges associated with climate change.”

In contrast, the CPPs were written prior to adoption of major recent environmental advances such as adoption of Critical Areas Ordinances, the formation of the Water Resource Inventory Areas (WRIAs), and the creation of the Puget Sound Partnership, among others. Consequently, many of the existing policies are no longer relevant and do not adequately implement the new direction found in VISION 2040. Additionally, the CPPs do not address climate change at all.

Staff proposes a full revision of the Environment chapter with draft language for 18 environmental policies and Goal statement as shown in Attachment B for GMPC review and comment. The new focus for the Environment Chapter will be on those issues that cross jurisdictional boundaries, have cross-jurisdictional impacts, or require a strong policy foundation for continuation. In addition to the policies proposed in the Environment chapter, environmental policies will also likely be found in the Development Patterns, Transportation and Public Services chapters of the CPP document.

Regional Coordination and Finance

The Executive Committee directed staff to integrate policies regarding regional coordination and finance throughout the CPPs in their appropriate topical chapters. As staff continues working on policy language, such policies will be drafted accordingly. At this time, staff has a single draft policy for GMPC review and consideration, as discussed here and shown in Attachment B of this report.

Existing CPP FW-1 establishes a multi-step process by which countywide growth management is accomplished in King County. Staff focused first on two elements of the existing policy—the process for amending the CPPs (existing FW-1, Step 9) and the criteria for making adjustments to the UGA (existing FW-1, Steps 7 and 8). Staff recommends that these concepts be separated into discrete policies.

The IJT recommends specific revisions to policy language for the CPP amendment process as shown in Attachment B of this report. The draft policy language more clearly and completely describes the existing process for review and amendment of the CPPs. Staff will continue work on policy language for the UGA adjustment process—and the remaining elements of existing FW-1—for GMPC review and comment in December, 2010.

PUBLIC OUTREACH

The Washington State Growth Management Act (RCW 36.70A.035) requires public participation opportunities for proposed amendments to comprehensive plans and development

regulations. In accordance with this requirement, staff presents a public participation strategy in this revision of the CPPs that includes the following elements:

1. Public Meetings:
 - a. Convene two public meetings—one in Seattle and one in East or South King County. The meeting would include a) a staff presentation about the CPPs and revision process, b) highlights of the current recommendations, and c) public testimony to GMPC members on the proposal.
2. Web-based Communication:
 - a. Enhance King County’s website to provide information about a) the CPP work plan, b) schedule of upcoming meetings and deliverables, c) proposed policy revisions as they are available, and d) contact information for further information.
 - b. Engage cities to provide common narrative on their websites about the CPP update process with appropriate reference to the King County web site for further information.
3. Stakeholder Engagement:
 - a. Continue to work with stakeholder groups such as realtors and builders, environmental groups, community groups, and housing advocates for technical and contextual input as appropriate.
4. Other Communication Opportunities:
 - a. Prepare common communication materials and utilize existing distribution lists to inform constituents about the CPP revisions.
 - b. Create a common set of briefing materials that staff in the 39 cities can use for presentation at their city council meetings or other community meetings.
 - c. Prepare strategy for outreach to traditionally under-represented communities.

NEXT STEPS

Staff will continue drafting CPP policy language for GMPC consideration in December, 2010. Staff will also initiate public outreach as recommended by GMPC.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

While no formal action by GMPC is requested at this time, staff seeks feedback from GMPC regarding the direction expressed by the draft policies included herein.

Draft Chapter Outline for King County Countywide Planning Policies¹

I. Vision and Framework

- A. *Vision*
- B. *Amendments to the CPPs*
- C. *Public Outreach (TBD)*

II. Environment

- A. *Overarching Goal: The quality of the natural environment in King County is restored and protected for future generations.*
- B. *Environmental Sustainability*
- C. *Earth and Habitat*
- D. *Flood Hazards*
- E. *Water Resources*
- F. *Air Quality and Climate Change*

III. Development Patterns

- A. *Overarching Goal*
- B. *Land Use (Urban Lands, Rural Lands, and Resource Lands)*
 - 1) Urban Growth Area
 - i. Definition
 - ii. Regional Growth Strategy and Growth Targets
 - iii. Criteria and process for UGA boundary adjustment
 - iv. Buildable Lands evaluations and reasonable measures
 - v. Urban Separators
 - vi. Phasing of development
 - vii. Joint planning and annexation
 - viii. Residential areas, infill development, business location
 - ix. Land use, development patterns, and climate change
 - 2) Urban Centers
 - i. Designation criteria
 - ii. List centers and map (appendix)
 - iii. Planning and public investments
 - 3) Manufacturing/ Industrial Centers
 - i. Designation criteria
 - ii. List centers and map (appendix)
 - iii. Planning and public investments
 - 4) Other Locally Designated Centers
 - i. Guidance for local designation criteria
 - ii. Planning and public investments
 - 5) Rural Lands
 - i. Character and land uses
 - ii. Protection of the rural areas from urban development
 - 6) Resource Lands
 - i. Agricultural, Forestry, and Extractive lands

¹ This outline may be modified as CPP revisions are made.

- ii. Protection from encroachment and development
 - C. *Elements of Orderly Development and Design*
 - 1) Urban Design
 - 2) The Built Environment and Health
 - 3) Community Character and Historic Preservation
- IV. **Housing**
 - A. *Overarching Goal*
 - B. *Housing Diversity and Affordability*
 - 1) Affordable housing targets (appendix on methodology)
 - 2) Guidance for housing needs assessments
 - 3) Guidance for local comprehensive plan housing elements
 - 4) Jobs-housing balance
 - C. *Housing in Urban Centers*
 - D. *Best Housing Practices (may refer to appendix)*
- V. **Economy**
 - A. *Overarching Goal*
 - B. *Business*
 - 1) Key industry clusters
 - 2) Business retention, growth, and diversification
 - 3) Guidance for local comprehensive plan elements
 - 4) Public actions and tools
 - C. *People*
 - 1) Job training
 - 2) Social justice and equity
 - D. *Places*
 - 1) Environmental quality
 - 2) Land supply and infrastructure
 - 3) Centers focus
 - 4) Rural Areas and towns
- VI. **Transportation**
 - A. *Overarching Goal*
 - B. *Maintenance, Management, and Safety*
 - C. *Supporting the Growth Strategy*
 - D. *Greater Options and Mobility*
- VII. **Public Services**
 - A. *Overarching Goal*
 - B. *Services in General*
 - C. *Services by Type (including water supply)*
 - D. *Siting Facilities*

Draft Policy Language for GMPC Review and Comment

Environment Chapter

Staff proposes a full revision of the Environment chapter with draft language for 18 environmental policies and Goal statement as follows:

- **Overarching Goal:** The quality of the natural environment in King County is restored and protected for future generations.
- **Environmental Sustainability**
 - EN-1: Incorporate environmental protection and restoration efforts into local comprehensive plans to promote a balanced approach that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. Ensure a fair distribution of environmental benefits and burdens.
 - EN-2: Encourage low impact development approaches for managing stormwater, protecting water quality, minimizing flooding and erosion, protecting habitat, and reducing green house gas emissions.
 - EN-3: Identify and preserve regionally significant open space networks in both urban and rural areas. Develop strategies and funding to protect these valuable resources. Include lands that provide:
 - Physical or visual separation delineating growth boundaries or providing buffers between incompatible uses;
 - Active or passive outdoor recreation opportunities;
 - Habitat or migration corridors that preserve and enhance ecosystem resiliency in the face of urbanization and climate change;
 - Preservation of ecologically sensitive, scenic or cultural resources; or
 - Urban green space, habitats, and ecosystems.
- **Earth and Habitat**
 - EN-4: Coordinate approaches and standards for defining and protecting critical areas where functions and values cross jurisdictional boundaries.
 - EN-5: Encourage basin-wide approaches to wetland mitigation emphasizing preservation and enhancement of the highest quality wetlands and wetland systems.
 - EN-6: Develop an integrated and comprehensive approach to managing fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas, especially protecting endangered, threatened or sensitive species based on their ecological relationships.
 - EN-7: Continue to work through Water Resource Inventory Area (WRIA) Forums to implement salmon habitat protection and restoration priorities in approved WRIA plans.
- **Flood Hazards**
 - EN-8: Coordinate and fund flood hazard management efforts through the King County Flood Control District.
 - EN-9: Share local approaches to meeting federal standards for floodplain development.
 - EN-10: Work cooperatively with the federal, state, and regional agencies and forums to develop regional levee maintenance standards that meet public safety and habitat protection objectives.

- Water Resources
 - EN-11: Collaborate with the Puget Sound Partnership to implement the Puget Sound Action Agenda and to coordinate land use and transportation plans and actions for the benefit of Puget Sound.
 - EN-12: Manage natural drainage systems to improve water quality and wildlife habitat, minimize erosion and sedimentation, protect public health, and moderate peak storm water runoff rates. Work cooperatively among local, regional, state, national and tribal jurisdictions to establish, monitor and enforce consistent standards throughout drainage basins.
 - EN-13: Establish a multi-jurisdictional approach for funding and monitoring water quality outcome measures and identify opportunities for improving the efficiency and effectiveness of monitoring efforts needed for compliance with federal and state water quality permits.
- Air Quality and Climate Change
 - EN-14: Plan for land use patterns and transportation systems that minimize air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions, reduce impacts on public health, and support the mission of the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency, including:
 - Directing growth to urban centers and other mixed use/ high density locations that support mass transit, encourage non-motorized modes of travel, provide opportunities to increase physical activity, and reduce trip lengths;
 - Facilitating modes of travel other than single occupancy vehicles including transit, walking, bicycling, carpooling, and car sharing;
 - Encouraging new development to use low emission construction practices and “green” building techniques; and
 - Increasing use of low emission vehicles.
 - EN-15: Establish a countywide greenhouse gas reduction target that meets or exceeds state targets including the 2050 goal of a 50 percent reduction below 1990 levels.
 - EN-16: Establish a greenhouse gas emissions inventory and measurement framework for use by all King County jurisdictions to efficiently and effectively measure progress toward countywide targets established pursuant to EN-15.
 - EN-17: Plan and implement land use, transportation, and building practices that reduce consumption of fossil fuels.
 - EN-18: Formulate a climate change adaptation strategy that addresses the impacts of climate change to public health and safety, the economy, and to the built and natural environments including public and private infrastructure, water resources, and habitat.

FW-1 Amendments to the CPPs

Staff presents draft policy language that describes more clearly and completely the existing process for review and amendment of the CPPs as follows:

- FW-1: Maintain the currency of the Countywide Planning Policies through periodic review and amendment. Initiate and process all amendments at the Growth Management Planning Council (GMPC) through the process described below:

- Only the GMPC may initiate amendments to the CPPs except for amendments to the Urban Growth Area (UGA) that may also be initiated by King County;
- GMPC recommends amendments to the King County Council for consideration, possible amendment and approval;
- A majority vote of the King County Council both constitutes approval of the amendment and ratification on behalf of the residents of Unincorporated King County. Amendments cannot be modified during the ratification process;
- After approval and ratification by the King County Council, amendments are forwarded to each city and town for ratification; and
- Amendments must be ratified within 90 days of King County approval and require affirmation by the county and cities and towns representing at least 70% of the county population and 30% of those jurisdictions. Ratification is either by an affirmative vote of the city's or town's council or by no action being taken within the ratification period.

Meeting Date: August 12, 2010

GMPC Executive Committee Staff Report
KING COUNTY, WASHINGTON

RE: Policy Issues Related to the Update of the Countywide Planning Policies

PRESENTED BY: Interjurisdictional Staff Team

SUMMARY

The GMPC and staff have been engaged in the revision of the Countywide Planning Policies for nearly two years, establishing first the housing and employment targets for King County's jurisdictions. Since then, staff has dedicated its effort to scoping the revision of policy language, content and structure of the CPPs with direction from GMPC.

At the June, 2010 GMPC meeting, staff presented members with a discussion of policy areas in which the existing CPPs: a) are silent on particular tenets of the MPPs, b) do not adequately address specific issues, or c) that use outdated terminology. Staff received appropriate direction to continue work on policy revisions for most of these issues. However, GMPC directed staff to prepare a more robust presentation on several issues before providing further direction to staff.

In order to facilitate this work, Chair Constantine proposed that the Executive Committee convene over the summer months to follow staff progress prior to the September 2010 GMPC meeting. This staff report responds to that charge, and lists the seven policy issues for which staff requests guidance from the Executive Committee. The discussion of each issue is organized into three parts:

- VISION 2040 Direction: highlights specific direction that is provided by VISION 2040/ MPPs on each policy area or question.
- Existing Countywide Planning Policies: identifies how each policy area is currently handled in the CPPs.
- Options for Consideration: where possible, staff included several approaches for Executive Committee consideration in moving forward. In other cases, staff is not prepared to present the committee with specific options for consideration but is presenting an update of staff progress.

In addition, Attachment A to this report includes a detailed table of contents for the revised CPP document. Staff recognizes that this draft structure will need to be revised as necessary to reflect the policy vision and strategy approved by the GMPC.

KEY POLICY ISSUES

This staff report presents updates, options and recommendations on the following policy areas: climate change; Transfer of Development Rights; housing; the Regional Economic Strategy; economic activities in the Rural Cities and resource lands; healthy communities; and regional coordination and finance. Staff requests direction from the Executive Committee on the various options. With that direction, staff will continue drafting policy language for GMPC presentation in September, 2010. Discussion of each of these policy areas is below.

Issue 1. Climate Change

VISION 2040 Direction. VISION 2040 promotes a sustainable environment and calls on countywide planning policies to provide direction for programs and strategies to address reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, adaptation to the effects from climate change, and recognition of interjurisdictional issues related to greenhouse gas emissions. (*MPP-En-20 through 25*)

Existing Countywide Planning Policies. The CPPs do not address climate change at all.

Options for Consideration. Staff presents three possible alternatives for addressing climate change in the CPPs:

- Option 1: Provide overall goal statements regarding the importance of addressing climate change as well as specific, interrelated policies in each of the relevant chapters. New policies in the CPPs would address each of the following points by indicating responsibility (e.g. county, city or other) and a *quality* of outcome while providing the greatest latitude to each jurisdiction to determine specific standards and approaches for implementing the policies:
 - Commit to comply with state greenhouse gas emission targets (as per RCW 80.80.020) as a minimum;
 - Require an analysis of climate change impacts as part of the environmental (SEPA) review of proposed actions;
 - Reduce the rate of energy use per capita;
 - Pursue development of energy management technology;
 - Reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions through conservation, alternative energy sources, and reduction of vehicle miles travelled (VMT);
 - Take positive actions to reduce carbons (e.g. increase urban tree canopy); and
 - Anticipate and address impacts of climate change on public health, safety and habitat (e.g. health effects of higher temperatures, flooding, habitat distribution and stream flows).

- Option 2: Incorporate the same goal statements as Option 1 above with more guidance on implementation, *without* mandating specific standards or approaches. For example:
 - Countywide policies should provide guidelines for incorporating climate change analysis in SEPA review (e.g. project thresholds, standards for measures or benchmarks, levels of analysis); and
 - Countywide policies should provide guidelines for setting community targets to reduce energy use, carbons and GHG.
- Option 3: Incorporate the same goal statements and policies as Option 1 above *with* specific standards and quantifiable targets. For example:
 - Countywide policies should establish minimum thresholds for projects and analysis related to climate change to be incorporated into SEPA review requirements by each jurisdiction; and
 - Countywide policies should establish targets (consistent with state goals above) for King County and/or individual communities to reduce energy use, carbons and GHG emissions. As an alternative the CPPs could establish a process for setting the targets and require each community to comply by a specified date.

Issue 2. Transfer of Development Rights

VISION 2040 Direction. In VISION 2040, *MPP DP-48* encourages the use of Transfer of Development Rights (TDRs), Purchase of Development Rights (PDRs), and conservation incentives. The use of these tools is intended to preserve rural and resource lands while focusing additional growth within Urban Growth Areas (UGAs) and especially cities.

VISION 2040 *DP-Action-12* also calls for collaboration in the development of a regional strategy for TDRs, PDRs, and other techniques for protecting rural and resource lands from overdevelopment. The Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) has partnered with the Department of Commerce and the Cascade Land Conservancy to develop a regional approach to TDR and to foster its wider use in the region.

Existing Countywide Planning Policies. Current *CPP LU-14* directs TDRs, stating the following: “King County may allow transfer of density from Rural Area properties to other Rural or Urban Area properties in order to 1) secure a substantial dedication of significant land to the King County Open Space System; 2) provide permanent protection which is greater than that available through existing regulation to a significant natural resource; or 3) encourage retention of resource-based uses in the Rural Area. The County shall develop a mechanism to accomplish these objectives and provide that:

- a. Lands dedicated are first determined to be suitable for inclusion in the King County Open Space System;

- b. The protected natural resource is first determined to be of significance to King County citizens and the protection afforded is materially superior to that provided by existing regulations;
- c. The resulting development is located in proximity to the lands to be dedicated to public ownership or where it can be otherwise shown that the residents of this development will share in an overriding public benefit to be derived from the preservation of the dedicated lands or the protection of the natural resource;
- d. The resulting development in the Rural Area maintains rural character; and
- e. There shall be no net increase in density within the Rural Area as a result of this density transfer.”

Options for Consideration. Staff presents the following alternatives regarding TDRs to more fully implement guidance set forth in VISION 2040 (further staff work and interagency collaboration will be necessary to address each of these points in a final proposed policy or policies for consideration by the GMPC):

- Revise current policy *LU-14* and consider moving to different subsection of Development Pattern chapter.
- Amend CPPs to prioritize TDRs from resource and rural lands to urban lands, explicitly within cities.
- Provide encouragement and guidance to cities on 1) identifying receiving areas within their borders, 2) interlocal agreements such as with the county, and 3) tie-ins with other planning objectives and incentives for participation in TDR from county to city lands. Consider the following two general approaches:
 - Encourage cities to partner with King County to use TDR, including identifying receiving areas within cities, to implement TDR through interlocal agreements, and to coordinate with other agencies to identify and secure opportunities to fund infrastructure within city receiving areas.
 - Provide incentives for cities to partner with King County or other agencies to participate in a countywide or regional TDR program.
- Delete reference to rural to rural transfers in the CPPs entirely and specifically add a prohibition on resource to rural transfers. Or, at a minimum, significantly qualify the option of the Rural Area as a receiving site with strict limitations, as currently practiced under King County’s TDR program.
- Address use of TDR where appropriate in the CPPs on the UGA expansion process and criteria.
- Clarify criteria for identifying sending areas and reference cities as participants in identifying areas of importance to them.
- Address and encourage use of PDRs (Purchase of Development Rights) and/ or other conservation techniques in separate policy.

Issue 3. Housing

VISION 2040 Direction. In VISION 2040, *MPP-H-2* calls for counties and cities to “achieve and sustain—through preservation, rehabilitation, and new development—a sufficient supply of

housing to meet the needs of low income, moderate income, and special needs individuals and households that is equitably and rationally distributed throughout the region.”

In order to implement the housing policies, *H-Action-1* and *H-Action-2* call for a regionally coordinated housing strategy and program of technical assistance, including guidance for developing affordable housing targets.

Existing Countywide Planning Policies. Current *CPP AH-2* states: “All jurisdictions shall share the responsibility for achieving a rational and equitable distribution of affordable housing... Each jurisdiction shall plan for a number of housing units affordable to households with incomes between 50 and 80 percent of the median County household income that is equal to 17 percent of its projected net household growth. In addition, each jurisdiction shall plan for a number of housing units affordable to households with incomes below 50 percent of the median County household income that is either 20 or 24 percent of its projected net household growth.” Additional policy language elaborates on the expectations for the county and cities in working toward achievement of the affordable housing targets.

Options for Consideration. Staff is not prepared at this time to present the Executive Committee with policy options for consideration. However, the following discussion provides an update on the work to date regarding housing CPPs.

A technical committee, comprised of housing staff from multiple jurisdictions and organizations, is meeting to discuss a range of housing issues, starting with the affordable housing targets. The subcommittee’s goal is to provide recommendations to the GMPC at the September meeting.

Issues likely to be addressed by the technical committee include:

- Do the current policies result in opportunities for affordable housing throughout the county? If not, what alternative approaches should be considered?
- Affordable housing targets as currently defined have presented difficulties in our ability to monitor progress over time. What changes to the monitoring process could rectify this problem?
- Are there any changes to the affordable housing targets themselves which are recommended to address the issues above?
- Should the CPPs be revised to clarify expectations for local government implementation of the affordable housing targets and policies, including the comprehensive plan and other measures?

Issue 4. Regional Economic Strategy

VISION 2040 Direction. VISION supports the Prosperity Partnership’s Regional Economic Strategy, which takes a two-pronged approach:

- Support fundamental economic foundations, such as education, technology, infrastructure and quality of life.

- Promote specific economic clusters: aerospace, clean technology, information technology, life sciences, logistics and international trade, military, and tourism.

Existing Countywide Planning Policies. The CPPs call for working with Snohomish and Pierce counties to develop a joint regional economic strategy and for the local adoption of economic development policies. Since the inception of the CPPs, regional efforts have led to the Prosperity Partnership.

Existing CPPs do encourage the creation and sustenance of economic vitality in the region. *CPP ED-7* calls for jurisdictions to establish economic diversification and development goals for the multi-County region. *CPP ED-9* states that jurisdictions shall “recognize businesses, facilities, and institutions within their boundaries that provide opportunities to maintain economic stability and realize economic growth for the entire region. These include major educational facilities, research institutions, health care facilities, high value added manufacturing facilities and port facilities among others.” However, the CPPs do not speak specifically to the Regional Economic Strategy adopted by VISION 2040.

Options for Consideration. Staff presents two options for revising the Economic chapter of the CPPs regarding the Regional Economic Strategy:

- Option 1: Reference and reinforce the Regional Economic Strategy, supporting the region’s identified economic clusters as identified in the regional strategy. New policies should reflect VISION’s organizational emphasis of business, people and places as the means to frame the county’s economic policies. The CPPs that called for development of local and regional plans have now been satisfied and should be removed.
- Option 2: Reinforce and apply a finer grain to the Regional Economic Strategy. This should provide the county with the opportunity to put greater emphasis on economic elements specific to King County and provide policy direction at a greater level of detail. For example, the CPPs could identify specific geographic areas in the county as target areas for specific economic clusters or additional “micro-clusters” unique to King County.

Issue 5. Economic Activities in Rural Cities and Resource Lands

VISION 2040 Direction. *MPPs EC-21 and EC-22* call for focus of appropriate employment growth into local centers, and ensuring that employment in and adjacent to resource lands is compatible with resource functions and character and do not conflict with rural character and resource-based land uses.

Existing Countywide Planning Policies. Existing CPPs are largely silent on these issues.

Options for Consideration. Staff recommends the following policy direction:

- Acknowledge that Rural Cities are recognized as the economic and cultural centers of the Rural Area and also the Natural Resource Lands, while stating that development in rural cities

must be of a size and scale that will ensure compatibility with the surrounding rural and resource lands and does not lead to a need to extend urban services outside city boundaries.

Issue 6. Healthy Communities

VISION 2040 Direction. VISION 2040 addresses the connection between health and land use within the Development Patterns chapter by acknowledging that health and well-being are linked with how we live and how we get around. VISION 2040 presents innovative approaches to maintaining a wide variety of healthy, accessible, and well-designed communities.

Specifically, VISION 2040 specifically calls on countywide planning policies to:

- Incorporate health considerations into countywide decision-making (*MPP-DP-44*).
- Provide guidance for planning that addresses the three major themes of (1) healthy environment, (2) physical activity and well-being, and (3) safety. (*MPP-DP-43 through 47*).
- Promote local food production within the region. (*MPP-DP-47*).

Further, VISION calls for:

- The maintenance of a healthy natural environment for all residents of the region, regardless of social or economic status (*MPP-En-3, 4*).
- The development of a transportation system that minimizes negative impacts to human health (*MPP-T-7*).
- The protection of the environment and public health and safety when providing services and facilities (*MPP-PS-1*).
- The encouragement of health and human services facilities near centers and transit (*MPP-PS-16*).

Existing Countywide Planning Policies. The existing Countywide Planning Policies do not address the linkage between health and land use.

Options for Consideration. GMPC directed staff to address public health in the CPPs. IJT is working with Seattle & King County Public Health staff to analyze the scope of the health policies to be included in the CPPs. Further, the Board of Health is developing standards that are intended to assist land use and transportation planners working at regional, county and city levels with identifying actions and strategies that will improve the health of residents and communities throughout King County. This information will be useful when drafting policies that link land use and transportation and health.

Presently, staff presents two approaches to incorporate public health in the CPPs:

- Option 1. Fully integrate Healthy Community policies throughout the proposed chapter structure (Attachment A) to strengthen the concept that health is not only a product of the health care system, but also a product of our agricultural, transportation, land use, housing, environmental, educational, energy, and economic policies. In addition, call out the health policy focus by providing an overall health framework and community healthy standards in

the Executive Summary and in the introduction to each chapter. This would emphasize the health connections to that policy area.

- Option 2. Create a new chapter of the Countywide Planning Policies entitled “Healthy Communities” to highlight the importance of health in overall land use planning. A stand-alone chapter discussing the linkages between health and various planning elements can bring special prominence and visibility to community health-related goals. In addition, a separate chapter could fit the various health elements more naturally together in the same section. Careful attention would be needed to ensure that policies in other chapters are not in conflict with health chapter policies so that the overall healthy communities’ goal is achieved.

Issue 7. Regional Coordination and Finance

VISION 2040 Direction. VISION 2040 implies that there must be regional coordination for many actions inclusive of financing, but it includes little explicit policy to that effect, except that *MPP-G-1* calls for the coordination of planning efforts among jurisdictions where there are common borders or related regional issues to facilitate a common vision. In addition, *MPP-D-7* states that priority for regional transportation funding should be given to projects in regional growth centers [referred to as Urban Centers in the CPPs].

Existing Countywide Planning Policies. The basis for the CPPs was coordination among jurisdictions to make the CPPs function. While clearly not alone, Chapter X focuses on Regional Finance and Governance (RF&G), calling for explicit regional plans for governance and finance. Such efforts were undertaken in the late 1990’s and were not successful. Since then many of the RF&G objectives have been or are nearly accomplished such as defining and identifying providers of urban services. Likewise, much of the unincorporated urban area has been annexed.

In the past 20 years, many needs for the funding for regional infrastructure have been centered at PSRC, Prosperity Partnership, Sound Transit and the Cascade Water Alliance, of which only PSRC existed at the adoption of the CPPs. Additionally, since the adoption of the CPPs major changes have occurred within King County government through charter amendments and financial constraints.

Many of the CPP policies were intended to provide direction to local jurisdictions in the preparation of their first comprehensive plan under GMA; with those plans completed, many of those policies can be deleted as the agreements are memorialized elsewhere or are no longer needed.

Options for Consideration. Staff presents two approaches to incorporate regional coordination and finance into the CPPs:

- Option 1. Integrate policies about regional coordination and finance throughout the CPPs in the appropriate topical chapters (Attachment A). For example, policies addressing regional coordination of transportation services and financing would be placed in the Transportation chapter. This option also places key regional coordination and finance policies in the Vision

and Framework chapter as a means to ground these concepts and strategies throughout the CPPs.

- Option 2. Create a chapter in the Countywide Planning Policies entitled “Regional Coordination and Finance.” This chapter would include policies that address:
 - Prioritization of regional investments to achieve implementation of the regional growth strategy;
 - Identification of potential regional investment strategies; and
 - Coordination and communication between jurisdictions on levels of service standards.

This option should pull policies (amended as necessary) from other chapters of the existing CPPs, including Land Use, Transportation and Community Character among others:

- *LU-47 and LU-60 [Incentives for Centers]* which call for regional financial strategies and funding sources for urban infrastructure and services and consider appropriate amendments;
- *FW-21 & 22, T-15, 18 & 19*, regarding regional funding of transportation improvements;
- *CC-7, 9 & 13* regarding Countywide funding of parks and open space and coordinated park level of service standards;
- *FW-29* regarding funding and prioritization of Countywide facilities;
- *S-1* regarding a Countywide process for siting facilities of a Countywide or statewide nature; and
- *ED-18* regarding regional funding of infrastructure in support of economic development in light of the work of the Prosperity Partnership.

In both Options 1 and 2, FW-1 will be deleted and replaced by:

- Moving all but *steps 8a and 9* to an introduction detailing the history and accomplishments of the CPPs to date;
- Developing a new policy from *step 8a* describing the current process and criteria for GMPC evaluation of changes to the Urban Growth Boundary; and
- From *step 9* prepare a new policy to describe the current process for amending the CPPs. Revise *FW-1* for currency and applicability.

NEXT STEPS

With direction provided by the Executive Committee on the policy issues presented here, staff will continue work on drafting CPP policy language and policy options for consideration by the full council in September, 2010. Staff will also present GMPC with draft language and progress on affordable housing target methodology.